DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 719 FL 008 200

AUTHOR Deosaran, Ramesh A.
TITLE The 1975 Every Student Survey: Program Placement Related to Selected Countries of Birth and Selected Languages.
INSTITUTION Toronto Board of Education (Ontario). Research Dept.
PUB DATE Aug 76
NOTE 68p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Economic Factors; *Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Origins; Immigrants; *Non English Speaking; Occupations; *School Surveys; *Socioeconomic Background; Socioeconomic Influences; Student Characteristics; *Student Placement
IDENTIFIERS Canada; *Ontario (Toronto)

ABSTRACT

This is the third in a series of four reports from Toronto's 1975 Every Student Survey. This report describes the relationships between students' social and demographic background and program placement in the elementary and secondary school in the Toronto school system. Its purpose is to examine the relationships between program placement and both ethnic background and parental occupational status. The survey upon which the report is based established that almost 50% of the 1975 school population in Toronto came from low socio-economic backgrounds; 46% had English as a second language, and almost 60 nations were claimed as "country of birth" by at least 25 students per nation. Approximately 7.5% of the elementary school population was served by special education programs, and approximately 60% of the secondary school population was enrolled in the fifth level of secondary school. Students' background characteristics were consistently related to program placement. The socioeconomic background of students in the Toronto school was generally a far better predictor of both special class placement and level of study in the secondary school than either country of birth or mother tongue. (Author/CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131719

FL

RESEARCH SERVICE

issued by the

Research Department

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A00 8206

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO

ISSN 0316-8786

THE 1975 EVERY STUDENT SURVEY

Program Placement Related to Selected Countries of Birth and Selected Languages

Ramesh A. Deosaran

#140

August, 1976

PREFACE

This is the third in a series of four reports arising from the 1975 Every Student Survey. This survey is very similar to one done in 1970.

The present report provides further relationships between students' social and demographic background and program placement in the elementary and secondary school. It also provides some comparisons with data from the 1970 survey. Some implications of the findings are discussed.

The preparation of these reports was made possible by the assistance of many persons, most notably Dr. E. N. Wright. Our appreciation also goes out to Dr. Jack Murray, Val McLeod, Janis Gershman, and Lynda Groves -- all of whom assisted in different but important ways.

Ramesh A. Deosaran

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	1
RESULTS	4
New Canadian Status and Occupation	4
One and No Parent Families	10
Selected Countries of Birth	11
Selected Mother Tongue	15
Elementary School	16
Secondary School	20
1975 and 1970 Comparison (Elementary)	24
1975 and 1970 Comparison (Secondary)	25
SUMMARY	27
DISCUSSION	30
REFERENCES	36
APPENDIX A - Programs Within Special Class Categories A, B, and C	38
APPENDIX B - Program Placement of Students Who Did Not Have Both Parents in the Home (1970 Data)	39
APPENDIX C - Head of Household's Occupation for Students Born in Great Britain, United States and the West Indies	41
APPENDIX D - Students from the West Indies (Categorized by Specific Country)	43
APPENDIX E - Level of Study Recorded by Secondary School Students	45
APPENDIX F - Socio-economic Codes for Household Heads	47
APPENDIX G - Statistical Table	49

EXPLANATORY NOTE

Some of the groupings of countries and languages in the tables of this report may not reflect current political realities or conventional linguistic distinctions.

In the case of languages, the coding reflects the students' responses as accurately as possible. For instance, many students reported that their mother tongue was "Serbo-Croatian" others "Serbian" and still others "Croatian." No attempt was made to correct or rationalize such apparent inconsistencies.

The coding system used for countries was developed first in 1970 prior to our knowing the origins of all students. For the most part, the coding of countries in 1975 was held as closely as possible to that used in the 1970 survey to facilitate comparisons between the two surveys. Moreover, in order to compile the results as efficiently as possible, some geographically contiguous or politically related countries were combined. Examples include the West Indies; Russia/Ukraine; India/Ceylon and Pakistan/Bangladesh. In preparing the 1975 report, some previously grouped countries were reported individually, such as the countries in the West Indies. However, the West Indian category was still retained for students who reported "West Indies" as their country of origin.

The Board of Education is aware that some combinations are deemed inappropriate by some people. In future, every effort will be made to acknowledge, as fully as possible, significant political and cultural differences.

INTRODUCTION

This is the third in a series of four reports from the 1975 Every Student Survey. The first report (Deosaran & Wright, 1976, #138) gave a comprehensive description of some important demographic, social and academic characteristics of the students in the Toronto school system. The results illustrated the pluralistic nature of the school population and the distribution of ethnic and occupational groups across the six administrative areas of the Toronto school system. The first report outlined some relationships between the social background of students and the types of class or program they attended in the elementary and secondary schools.

The first report also established that Canadian-born students whose first language was English and non-Canadian-born students for whom English was a second language were slightly more likely than the other two immigrant/language groups to be in Special Class A.[1] Students in the former group were also more likely to be in Special Classes B and C. Students who were Canadian-born with English as a second language, and the non-Canadian-born, with English as a first language were more frequently enrolled in Level 5 courses than were other immigrant/language groups.

The second report (Deosaran, 1976, #139), reported relationships between the mother tongue and country of birth of students and the occupational status of their parents. The situation of students with working mothers was also examined. One of the most significant findings in the second report was the relatively strong relationship between students' language background and the occupational status of their parents.

---

1 Special Class A contains students with various academic problems and some regular class students who receive only withdrawal assistance; Special Class B contains those with health-related problems (e.g., vision); Special Class C contains those with other problems (e.g., behavioural).

This third report attempts to relate students' background to class placement in the elementary schools and level of study in the secondary schools.[2] The purpose is to examine the relationships between program placement and both ethnic background and parental occupational status simultaneously.

The fourth report (#141) in this series will focus on the special education programs. The backgrounds of all the students served by specific special programs will be examined in detail. In the present report the individual special programs have been grouped into three types -- A, B, and C, according to the system shown in Appendix A. These particular combinations were used to permit comparisons with the 1970 survey results. However, changes in special education between 1970 and 1975 make comparisons somewhat tenuous. Students in Special Class C, for example, were included with the B group in 1970. They were set out separately in this report to reflect expansion of some programs and to remove from Special Class B all programs which were not health-related. One significant change in special education not reflected in this report is the increase in withdrawal programs. In 1970 there were only 4 such programs; in 1975 there were 38. Each of these programs serves more students (30 to 35) than regular self-contained programs (12 to 16). But the extra students served by withdrawal programs were not included in either the 1970 or 1975 data. The present report underestimates the number of students actually being served, especially in Special Class A. However, the fourth report includes all students in withdrawal programs.

Despite the underestimation in the present report, the proportion of students reported to be in Special Class A increased marginally (3.5% to 4.1%) from 1970 to 1975 (Report #138, Table 15). Practically all of this

---

2 Henceforth described as "program placement."

apparent increase can be accounted for by the decrease in the elementary school population from 70141 to 58406 during the same period. Readers with particular interests in special education will find more definitive results in the fourth report. The grouping of students into groups A, B and C does not begin to reflect the variations in the special programs offered these students, but does permit an examination of placement in special programs now, in comparision to five years ago.

RESULTS

The first four tables illustrate relationships between the immigrant/language status of students, parental occupational status, and program placement. Placement is indexed by per cent of enrolment in Special Classes A, B, and C in the elementary school and in the five different levels of study in the secondary school. The second four tables in the text illustrate relationships between selected parental occupations, selected language backgrounds of students, and program placement. These tables allow finer distinctions within the student population and facilitate additional comparisons between students of diverse social and ethnic backgrounds.

Because percentages of numbers below 100 magnify differences, caution must be exercised in interpreting results involving small numbers. A line has been drawn through such numbers to remind readers of this hazard.

New Canadian Status and Occupation

The student population was divided into four major immigrant/language groups[3]:

(1) students born in Canada with English as a first language;

(2) students born in Canada with English not as first language (this includes both those students who learned English as a second language and those who learned English and another language at the same time);[4]

(3) students not born in Canada with English as first language;

(4) students not born in Canada with English not as first language (this includes both those students who learned English as a second language and those who learned English and another language at the same time).[4]

---

3 Described as immigrant/language groups in this report.

4 Students in Groups 2 and 4 will be described in this report as students with English as a second language.

TABLE 1

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO WERE BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS THEIR MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD)

Occupational Categories	*Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
2 labourers, taxi drivers	8129	2956	6.9	1.7	1.6	6.2	20.0	33.7	40.0
3 sheetmetal workers	1547	611	4.5	1.6	1.4	5.2	12.9	33.6	48.3
4 sales clerks, machinists	954	462	5.9	2.1	1.3	6.5	10.4	26.4	56.7
5 printings workers, pressmen	3289	1842	2.6	1.6	1.5	2.4	8.6	28.2	60.8
6 dental technicians	2331	1463	2.8	2.0	1.9	1.6	5.5	16.9	76.0
7 musicians, athletes	1315	616	2.1	1.3	2.3	0.8	6.3	13.3	79.5
8 clergymen, librarians	2179	1041	1.4	1.2	1.3	0.7	2.1	9.8	87.4
9 accountants, engineers	3869	1714	0.8	0.7	1.1	0.8	1.9	6.8	90.5
10 retired, workmen's compensation	220	334	15.0	3.2	1.4	5.1	19.5	21.9	53.6
11 welfare, mother's allowance	~~77~~	~~50~~	~~2.6~~	~~6.5~~	~~6.5~~	~~28.0~~	~~36.0~~	~~16.0~~	~~20.0~~
12 adult training or retraining	242	~~46~~	1.2	0.0	2.5	~~6.5~~	~~2.2~~	~~10.9~~	~~80.4~~
13 unemployed	1107	235	14.3	2.3	1.2	17.4	27.2	27.2	28.1
14 housewife	2396	723	10.2	2.1	1.3	15.3	26.4	24.8	33.6
15 respondent on his/her own	-	~~59~~	-	-	-	~~6.8~~	~~6.8~~	~~35.6~~	~~50.8~~
16 group home head	~~64~~	~~74~~	~~15.6~~	~~4.7~~	~~1.6~~	~~31.1~~	~~36.5~~	~~13.5~~	~~18.9~~
TOTAL	27619	12226	5.0	1.6	1.5	4.2	11.3	22.5	61.4

* Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

TABLE 2

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO WERE BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS NOT THE MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD)

	Occupational Categories	*Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
		Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
2	labourers, truck drivers	9288	3489	2.8	1.2	0.3	2.4	8.2	27.3	62.1
3	sheetmetal workers	1054	420	1.8	0.9	0.4	1.7	7.9	20.2	70.2
4	sales clerks, machinists	394	198	2.0	1.5	0.8	1.0	4.0	18.7	76.3
5	printing workers, pressmen	914	618	1.6	1.3	0.2	1.3	5.0	18.1	75.6
6	dental technicians	1444	775	1.9	0.5	0.4	0.9	5.5	13.0	80.5
7	musicians, athletes	214	106	0.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.9	15.1	83.0
8	clergymen, librarians	263	196	1.1	1.1	0.8	0.0	3.6	15.3	81.1
9	accountants, engineers	437	204	0.7	0.5	1.1	2.0	1.5	5.9	90.7
10	retired, workmen's compensation	102	167	6.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	19.8	71.9
11	welfare, mother's allowance	~~13~~	~~10~~	~~15.4~~	~~7.7~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~20.0~~	~~40.0~~	~~40.0~~
12	adult training, retraining	~~33~~	~~19~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~15.8~~	~~10.5~~	~~73.7~~
13	unemployed	501	179	5.4	1.0	0.2	5.6	17.9	26.8	49.7
14	housewife	281	236	7.1	2.1	0.0	3.4	15.3	26.3	55.1
15	respondent on his/her own	-	~~16~~				~~12.5~~	~~0.0~~	~~12.5~~	~~75.0~~
16	group home head	~~3~~	~~14~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~7.1~~	~~35.7~~	~~35.7~~	~~21.4~~
	TOTAL	14941	6647	2.6	1.1	0.3	2.0	7.6	22.6	67.8

* Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

The distribution of Canadian-born, English first language students by type of program and parental occupational status is presented in Table 1. Table 2 shows a similar distribution for Canadian-born students with English as a second language. Tables 3 and 4 present the distributions for the remaining immigrant/language groups. Parental occupation was classified according to the Blishen Scale[5] and subsequently combined into eight ordered categories (2 to 9) which are used in the tables. Categories 10 to 16 were developed to identify non-employed groups such as "retired," "on welfare," "unemployed," "housewife," etc.

Tables 1 to 4 illustrate the critical role played by socio-economic background of the students in program placement for each of the four immigrant/language groups. These four tables indicate that, for each group, the lower the occupational status of the parents, the more likely is the student to be in Special Class A. Furthermore, for each group, the higher the occupational status of the parent, the more likely is the student to be enrolled in a Level 5 course. For instance, among the Canadian-born students with English as first language (Table 1), students with parents as labourers, taxi drivers, packers, etc. (Category 2) have 4 chances out of 10 of being enrolled in Level 5 courses; by comparison, students whose parents are accountants, engineers, etc. (Category 9) have 9 chances in 10 of being enrolled in such courses.

While a clear social class differential pervades all four groups, it is least pronounced among the Canadian-born students for whom English is a second language (Table 2). Amongst all the immigrant/language groups, the trend is clear: the higher the social class background of the student, the less likely is he/she to be in Special Class A in elementary

---

5 This scale ranks over 300 occupations according to income, education, and prestige. See Report #138 for a description of the scale and its application in this study.

TABLE 3

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO WERE NOT BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS THEIR MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD)

	Occupational Categories	*Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
		Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
2	labourers, truck drivers	1858	677	4.2	0.6	0.3	7.6	16.4	25.4	50.5
3	sheetmetal workers	470	181	5.7	0.4	1.3	5.0	16.0	23.8	55.2
4	sales clerks, machinists	200	~~92~~	7.5	1.0	1.0	~~4.3~~	~~14.1~~	~~19.6~~	~~62.0~~
5	printing workers, pressmen	429	233	1.6	1.4	0.5	3.4	9.0	23.6	63.9
6	dental technicians	400	221	2.3	1.0	0.3	1.8	9.5	19.9	68.8
7	musicians, athletes	146	~~80~~	0.7	1.4	3.4	~~2.5~~	~~3.8~~	~~11.3~~	~~82.5~~
8	clergymen, librarians	265	110	1.1	0.4	0.4	0.9	3.6	2.7	92.7
9	accountants, engineers	605	281	0.3	1.5	0.2	1.1	3.6	6.8	88.6
10	retired, workmen's compensation	~~18~~	~~16~~	~~18.8~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~6.3~~	~~12.5~~	~~12.5~~	~~68.8~~
11	welfare, mother's allowance	~~2~~	~~-~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~
12	adult training, retraining	~~67~~	~~22~~	~~0.0~~	~~1.5~~	~~1.5~~	~~0.0~~	~~4.5~~	~~9.1~~	~~86.4~~
13	unemployed	153	~~51~~	3.3	2.0	0.7	~~4.3~~	~~19.6~~	~~13.7~~	~~62.7~~
14	housewife	134	~~74~~	8.2	2.2	0.0	~~14.9~~	~~14.9~~	~~17.6~~	~~52.7~~
15	respondent on his, her own	~~2~~	~~10~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~40.0~~	~~60.0~~
16	group home head	~~6~~	~~11~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~18.2~~	~~45.5~~	~~18.2~~	~~18.2~~
	TOTAL	4747	2059	3.3	0.9	0.5	4.8	11.7	19.1	64.4

* Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

TABLE 4

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO WERE NOT BORN IN CANADA AND FOR WHOM ENGLISH WAS NOT THE MOTHER TONGUE
(CATEGORIZED BY OCCUPATION OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD)

	Occupational Categories	*Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
		Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
2	labourers, truck drivers	7020	4571	4.9	0.8	0.1	5.7	13.9	32.2	48.2
3	sheetmetal workers	792	427	4.2	0.8	0.4	3.8	8.0	27.6	60.7
4	sales clerks, machinists	359	170	3.1	0.0	0.6	2.4	8.2	20.0	69.4
5	printing workers, pressmen	566	499	2.1	0.7	0.2	1.8	10.0	19.8	68.3
6	dental technicians	629	532	3.0	0.5	0.0	2.6	4.9	20.7	71.8
7	musicians, athletes	89	97	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	4.1	14.4	81.4
8	clergymen, librarians	191	106	0.5	1.0	0.0	1.9	2.8	13.2	82.1
9	accountants, engineers	403	226	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.4	8.0	91.2
10	retired, workmen's compensation	19	163	14.3	2.0	0.0	4.9	4.9	24.5	65.6
11	welfare, mother's allowance	11	3	27.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0
12	adult training, retraining	125	45	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9
13	unemployed	561	295	6.2	0.4	0.0	9.2	18.6	27.8	44.4
14	housewife	142	243	4.9	0.7	0.7	4.9	16.0	29.2	49.8
15	respondent on his/her own	1	55	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	14.5	83.6
16	group home head	2	6	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
	TOTAL	10940	7438	4.4	0.7	0.2	4.8	11.7	28.0	55.5

* Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

school or in a level lower than 5 in secondary school. The non-Canadian-born students with English as a second language (Table 4) also illustrate the relationship clearly. In the first report of this series it was seen that 56 per cent of the non-Canadian-born students with English as second language were enrolled in Level 5 courses. However, for this same group, Table 1 in the present report shows that 90 per cent of the students with parents as accountants, engineers, pilots, etc. (Category 9) enrolled in Level 5 as against 40 per cent of those with parents as labourers, taxi drivers, cleaners, etc., (Category 2).

There were no outstanding trends in the distributions by occupational status for Special Classes B or C. These results are consistent with those found in the 1970 survey.

One and No Parent Families

The first report in this series noted that 14.3 per cent of the students in the system lived in homes where only the mother was present; 1.9 per cent lived in father-only homes; and 2.2 per cent lived in homes where neither parent was present. Thus, almost one-fifth of the students surveyed did not live in homes where both parents were present. The situation of these students was examined more closely in terms of their enrolment in special classes in elementary school and the level of study in secondary school.

Table 5 illustrates the distributions of program placement for students from households representing selected occupational categories.[6] Category 2 is selected mainly because it contains more students than any of the other occupational categories.

---

6 Comparable data from the 1970 survey are shown in Appendix B.

Overall, one and no-parent homes contributed a significant proportion of their students to Special Class A. Six per cent of the students from mother-only homes were in such classes, about 7 per cent from father-only homes, and 9 per cent from homes where neither parent was present. But occupational status still made a difference. Almost 10 per cent of the students were in Special Class A if they gave their mothers' occupation as housewife in mother-only homes or their fathers' occupation as labourer, truck driver etc. (Category 2) in father-only homes.

Among secondary school students, the same proportion (56%) was enrolled in Level 5 courses from mother-only and father-only homes. A similar proportion (62%) were enrolled in Level 5 from homes where neither parent was present. In all of these family situations, a smaller proportion of students were enrolled in Level 5 where the "parent" was in a lower occupational category or a housewife.

Selected Countries of Birth

Since the 1970 Every Student Survey, there has been a noticeable increase in the number of Caribbean-born students in the Toronto school system. The first report (#138) in this series showed that the number of such students increased from about 1640 in 1970 to over 4000 in 1975. If the 839 students from Guyana are included, the number approximates 5000. Appendix D lists students according to the different (Caribbean) areas of birth. Table 6 establishes relationships between the socio-economic status of these students and program placement. The other two major sources of English-speaking students, Great Britain and the United States, are also considered. Caution must be exercised where the number of students in a group is small.

TABLE 5

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT HAVE BOTH PARENTS IN THE HOME (CATEGORIZED USING SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES)

Occupational Categories	*Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
Only Mother Present									
2 - Labourers	1636	824	5.6	1.2	0.9	5.8	20.0	27.1	47.1
14 - Housewife	2863	1228	9.6	1.8	1.1	11.1	21.5	25.2	42.3
ALL	8798	4243	6.0	1.3	1.3	6.0	15.2	22.4	56.4
Only Father Present									
2 - Labourers	415	246	9.6	1.7	1.2	5.3	17.9	37.4	39.4
ALL	1042	708	7.4	1.2	1.2	3.1	13.4	27.1	56.4
Neither Parent Present									
2 - Labourers	139	196	7.2	2.2	2.9	4.6	15.3	27.0	53.1
14 - Housewife	~~49~~	~~27~~	~~10.2~~	~~6.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~18.5~~	~~29.6~~	~~29.6~~	~~22.2~~
16 - Group Home Head	~~75~~	107	~~14.7~~	~~5.3~~	~~1.3~~	24.3	35.5	15.9	24.3
ALL	580	1352	9.0	2.9	1.7	5.7	12.6	19.4	62.2

* Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

TABLE 6

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO WERE BORN IN GREAT BRITAIN, THE UNITED STATES AND THE WEST INDIES (CATEGORIZED BY SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES)

Occupational Categories*	Number of Students**		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level			
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 and 2	3	4	5
Born in England and Scotland									
2 - Labourers	343	138	3.8	0.3	0.6	3.6	10.1	31.2	55.1
9 - Accountants	204	~~82~~	1.0	0.5	0.0	~~1.2~~	~~2.4~~	~~7.3~~	~~89.0~~
TOTAL***	1190	529	2.9	0.8	0.6	2.0	7.3	22.2	68.4
Born in United States									
2 - Labourers	~~76~~	~~20~~	~~1.3~~	~~2.6~~	~~0.0~~	~~5.0~~	~~20.0~~	~~25.0~~	~~50.0~~
9 - Accountants	268	~~94~~	0.0	1.1	0.4	~~2.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~4.3~~	~~93.6~~
TOTAL***	739	271	0.9	1.2	0.3	2.7	3.5	6.9	86.9
Born in West Indies									
2 - Labourers	1645	532	4.0	0.5	0.2	8.6	18.2	19.9	53.2
9 - Accountants	~~77~~	~~80~~	~~0.0~~	~~2.6~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~7.5~~	~~12.5~~	~~80.0~~
TOTAL***	3448	1444	3.8	0.7	0.4	6.2	15.3	18.5	60.0

* See Appendix D for distribution of occupational categories for the three countries.
** Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.
*** Includes students who gave no information on parents' occupation.

Approximatey 45 per cent of Caribbean-born students have parents who are labourers, porters, kitchen-helpers, etc. (Category 2) as against 9 and 5 per cent of the students born in the United States and Great Britain respectively. Conversely, approximately 3 per cent of Caribbean-born students have physicians, engineers, lawyers, etc. (Category 9) as parents, compared with 36 and 17 per cent of the students born in the United States and Great Britain (complete results in Appendix C).

All these students have English as their first language and as such form the bulk of the non-Canadian-born, English first language students (Group 3). The second report (#139) in this series revealed that 12 per cent of the non-Canadian-born, English first language students have parents who are physicians, engineers, lawyers, etc. (Category 9) and 36 per cent have parents who are labourers, porters, kitchen-helpers, etc. (Category 2). From this perspective it appears that the parents of Caribbean-born students are vastly under-represented within the professional occupations while parents of students from the other two countries are over-represented in such occupations. The opposite is true for Caribbean-born students whose parents are labourers, porters, kitchen-helpers, etc. (Category 2).

For each country in Table 6, students with parents in occupational category 9 (physicians, engineers, etc.) are less likely than those with parents in Category 2 (labourers, porters, etc.) to be in Special Class A, the difference being quite striking for students born in Great Britain and the Caribbean.

Students from low occupational status homes are much more likely to be enrolled in Levels 1 and 2 (secondary school) if they are from the Caribbean than if they are from Great Britain. It is

also apparent from Table 6 that students with parents in Category 2 (labourers, porters, kitchen-helpers, etc.) from each of the three countries are equally likely to be enrolled in Level 5 courses (about 50%). However, Caribbean-born students from high occupational status homes (Category 9) seem less likely than British or American-born students to be in Level 5. Nevertheless, the small number of students involved makes the statement tentative.

These trends resemble those found in the 1970 survey. However, there was a noticeable increase in the overall proportion of West Indian-born students enrolled in Level 5 (54 to 60%). This proportion also increased among the United States-born (77 to 87%), but remained constant for the British-born (67 to 68%).

Selected Mother Tongue

The strong relationship between the occupational status of parents and program placement was firmly established in the foregoing sections. But the question remains: If occupational status is held constant, does ethnic background still make a difference? Using mother tongue as an index of ethnic background, the question can be answered from Table 7. The program placement of students with nine different mother tongues is shown only for those from households where the head worked in the lowest status occupational category. Students who learned their mother tongue at the same time as they learned English are included in the table. The distribution of program placement for the Canadian-born students is presented in the upper part of the table and for their foreign-born counterparts in the lower part. To determine whether relationships between mother tongue and program placement persist across occupational categories, Table 8 was prepared. Its format is identical to

Table 7, but it includes students from all households, regardless of occupational status. The comparable results from the 1970 survey are reproduced in Tables 7A and 8A.

Elementary School

Table 7 shows that of the Canadian-born students, four of the nine language groups -- French, Italian, German and Portuguese -- each had more than 3 per cent of the students in Special Class A. While 8 per cent of Canadian-born French-speaking students were in Special Class A, this represents only 13 students. Numerically speaking, the Canadian-born Italian group contributed more students (122 out of 2711 students) than any other Canadian-born group to Special Class A.

Among the Canadian-born students, few language groups had more than 2 per cent of their students in Special Class B. The Italian-speaking group were again numerically largest with 65 students. All groups, except the German with 3 per cent, i.e. 5 students, had much less than 1 per cent of their students in Special Class C.

Examination of the data for non-Canadian-born students in the lower part of Table 7 reveals that three language groups -- Italian, Portuguese, and Greek -- each had more than 3 per cent of their students in Special Class A (the Ukrainian group had 10 per cent, but this amounts to only 2 students).

Table 7 shows too that only one group (Italian) of non-Canadian-born students had more than 2 per cent in Special Class B, each of the other eight language groups had less than 1 per cent. Almost no foreign-born students were in Special Class C.

TABLE 7A (1970 SURVEY)

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT LEARN ENGLISH AS A MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY MOTHER TONGUE AND INCLUDED ONLY THOSE WHERE THE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD WAS CATEGORIZED AS BEING IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY 2*)

Mother Tongue**	Number of Students***		% of Elementary Students in		% of Secondary Students in		
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Voc. Program	2 Year Prog.	5 Year Prog.
Born In Canada							
Italian	4454	441	3.0	1.2	8.8	5.4	58.0
Greek	1242	~~24~~	1.6	.4	~~12.5~~	~~8.3~~	~~66.7~~
Portuguese	630	~~7~~	1.6	1.6	~~28.6~~	~~0.0~~	~~42.8~~
Chinese	1184	~~78~~	.1	0.0	~~1.3~~	~~0.0~~	~~84.6~~
Polish	481	310	.8	.6	1.6	5.2	67.4
Ukrainian	535	364	1.9	.7	.5	3.0	78.8
German	406	113	2.2	1.7	.9	4.4	72.6
French	196	193	7.6	2.5	18.6	13.5	27.5
Not Born In Canada							
Italian	3145	2188	5.9	1.0	11.6	15.5	39.8
Greek	1152	364	3.2	.5	10.7	21.7	34.9
Portuguese	2089	651	5.9	.6	15.8	26.6	31.2
Chinese	461	370	1.3	.2	2.4	4.9	71.3
Polish	275	307	3.6	.7	2.6	11.4	50.8
Ukrainian	~~57~~	~~85~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~4.7~~	~~70.6~~
German	126	141	.8	0.0	3.5	6.4	58.1
French	~~64~~	~~55~~	~~1.6~~	~~0.0~~	~~1.8~~	~~10.9~~	~~54.5~~

* Occupational Category 2 includes occupations such as labourers, truck drivers, taxi drivers, waiters and porters. The following table (Table 8A) presents the data in a similar manner but does not subdivide the students by parents' occupations.

** Each language group includes both students who learned the language before English and students who learned the language at the same time as English.

*** Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

TABLE 7

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT LEARN ENGLISH AS A MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY MOTHER TONGUE AND INCLUDES ONLY THOSE WHERE ONE HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD WAS CATEGORIZED AS BEING IN OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORY 2*)

Mother Tongue**	Number of Students***		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level[a]			
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 & 2	3	4	5
Born In Canada									
Chinese	1377	402	1.0	0.5	0.1	1.7	3.7	7.7	86.8
French	157	122	8.3	2.5	0.6	7.4	20.5	41.0	31.1
Greek	2255	181	2.0	0.4	0.1	2.2	12.7	20.4	64.6
German	161	137	3.7	0.0	3.1	2.2	2.9	16.1	78.8
Italian	2711	1640	4.5	2.4	0.2	2.4	9.5	36.6	51.6
Polish	315	217	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.9	4.6	24.9	69.6
Portuguese	1094	139	3.4	1.2	0.3	8.7	17.3	36.0	38.1
Spanish	~~46~~	~~4~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~25.0~~	~~75.0~~
Ukrainian	291	246	0.7	1.4	0.7	0.8	2.8	11.0	85.4
Not Born In Canada									
Chinese	842	512	1.1	0.6	0.1	0.4	2.1	17.2	80.3
French	~~49~~	~~59~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~3.4~~	~~23.7~~	~~25.4~~	~~47.5~~
Greek	1001	373	3.6	0.7	0.1	3.0	10.7	27.6	58.7
German	~~31~~	~~30~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~2.6~~	~~18.4~~	~~28.9~~	~~50.0~~
Italian	859	1529	11.5	2.1	0.5	4.4	15.1	39.2	41.2
Polish	~~94~~	146	~~2.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	0.7	6.2	20.5	72.6
Portuguese	2614	1273	[illegible]	0.8	0.3	12.2	20.6	34.8	32.4
Spanish	425	132	[illegible]	0.2	0.0	3.0	12.9	24.2	59.8
Ukrainian	~~20~~	~~33~~	~~10.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~3.0~~	~~27.3~~	~~69.7~~

* Occupational category 2 includes occupations such as labourers, truck-drivers, waiters, porters etc.

** Each language group includes both students who learned the language before English and students who learned the language at the same time as English.

*** Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

a See Appendix E

Students in each of the nine language groups were categorized according to whether or not they were born in Canada. The question arises: Does it make a difference whether the students were born or not born in Canada? For most language groups, the answer is "yes." For instance, while 4 out of 100 Canadian-born Italian students were in Special Class A, 11 out of 100 non-Canadian-born Italian students attended such classes. A similar comparison in Table 7 shows that the proportion of Portuguese-speaking students in Special Class A was 3.4 per cent among Canadian-born, and 6.3% among those born in Portugal. However, the situation is dramatically reversed for French-speaking students: more than 8% of the Canadian-born are in Special Class A, but none of the 49 students who were born outside Canada are in it.

While Table 7 contains only students with parents as labourers, taxi drivers, porters, etc., Table 8 contains students with parents from all occupational categories. Of the Canadian-born students, only three language groups - French, Italian, Portuguese - had more than 3 per cent of the students in Special Class A. As in Table 7, the Canadian-born French-speaking group again had the highest proportion (6.8 per cent) in Special Class A, whereas less than 1 per cent of the foreign born were in such classes. Only one language group, Italian, had more than 2 per cent in Special Class B. Of the 8 remaining language groups, 6 had less than 1 per cent in Special Class B.

Among the non-Canadian-born, a high proportion of both the Italian and Portuguese-speaking students appeared in Special Class A (10.7% and 7.0%). (The 5% figure for Ukrainian-speaking students represents only 2 students.)

Of the foreign-born students, 3.5 per cent of Greek-speaking were in Special Class A, as were 1.9 per cent of the Polish-speaking, and 1.1 per cent of the Spanish-speaking. Less than 1 per cent of the [illegible]-born students whose mother tongues were Chinese, French or German were enrolled in Special Class A.

Except for the Italian-speaking group in Class B (1.9%), and the German-speaking group (1.6%) in Class C, all other language groups had less than 1 per cent in either of these two types of special class. Differences in special class placement among language groups are more evident in Special Class A than in either B or C.

Non-Canadian-born Greek, Italian, and Portuguese students in Table 8 were generally twice as likely as their Canadian-born counterparts to be in Special Class A. There were relatively small differences between the Canadian-born and foreign-born students among the Chinese, Polish and Spanish language groups. The pattern reversed for German and French. Being Canadian-born makes a difference in elementary class placement among some language groups, but not among others.

Secondary School

Tables 7 and 8 revealed wide variations in program placement between the different language groups. For instance, among Canadian-born students in Table 7, only two groups (Chinese and Ukrainian) had over 80 per cent of the students enrolled in Level 5, while two other groups (French and Portuguese) had only one-third of their students enrolled in this level; the proportions for the other five groups lay within this range.

Of the non-Canadian-born students in Table 7, only the Chinese group had as much as 80 per cent in Level 5. The results for

some of the other groups were as follows: Polish 72.6%; Spanish and Greek close to 60%; Italian, 41.2%; and Portuguese 32.4%. Canadian-born and non-Canadian-born Portuguese-speaking students were more likely than any of the other language groups to be in Levels 1 and 2. The distributions in Table 7 reveal that the substantial differences in program placement between language groups noted at the elementary level also exist at the secondary level.

Table 8 illustrates the relationships between students' mother tongue and program placement, regardless of parents' occupational status. Among the Canadian-born, four language groups (Chinese, Spanish, Ukrainian, and German) had more than 79 per cent of their students in Level 5. The Spanish group had 88 per cent, but this involved only 14 out of 17 students. About 70 to 75 per cent of the Polish and Greek-speaking students were enrolled in Level 5, compared to 50 to 55 per cent of the Italian and French-speaking and 42 per cent of the Portuguese students. Both Canadian-born and non-Canadian-born Portuguese students were more likely than any of the other groups in Table 8 to be in Levels 1 and 2. This tendency was similar to that found in Table 7.

TABLE 8

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT LEARN ENGLISH AS A MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY MOTHER TONGUE AND INCLUDING STUDENTS FROM ALL OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES)

Mother Tongue*	Number of Students**		% of Elementary Students in			% of Secondary Students in Level[a]			
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Class "C"	1 & 2	3	4	5
Born In Canada									
Chinese	2213	750	1.1	0.5	0.0	1.0	2.7	7.3	88.9
French	531	489	6.8	1.7	1.1	4.5	16.2	27.2	52.1
Greek	3575	400	1.6	0.3	0.2	2.0	9.3	18.5	70.3
German	522	426	2.3	0.2	1.3	0.9	3.5	16.2	79.3
Italian	3755	2455	4.4	2.4	0.2	2.3	9.9	33.6	54.3
Polish	587	444	1.2	0.9	0.3	0.9	4.5	19.8	74.8
Portuguese	1495	217	3.5	1.0	0.3	6.4	15.2	36.4	41.9
Spanish	107	~~17~~	1.9	0.0	0.9	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~11.8~~	~~88.2~~
Ukrainian	577	558	1.0	0.7	0.5	1.1	3.2	11.6	84.1
Not Born In Canada									
Chinese	1501	1182	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.5	1.8	13.6	84.1
French	136	146	0.7	0.7	0.7	3.4	12.3	24.0	60.3
Greek	1499	588	3.5	0.7	0.1	3.3	10.4	27.0	59.4
German	122	101	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.0	10.9	22.8	65.3
Italian	1132	2105	10.7	1.9	0.1	4.6	14.7	38.2	42.5
Polish	159	273	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.7	4.8	19.4	75.1
Portuguese	3404	1801	7.0	0.8	0.3	11.5	20.0	32.5	36.0
Spanish	727	285	1.1	0.6	0.0	2.2	10.5	21.8	65.6
Ukrainian	~~39~~	~~65~~	~~5.1~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~0.0~~	~~3.1~~	~~20.0~~	~~76.9~~

* Each language group includes both students who learned the language before English and students who learned the language at the same time as English.

** Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

a See Appendix E

TABLE 8A (1970 SURVEY)

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS WHO DID NOT LEARN ENGLISH AS A MOTHER TONGUE (CATEGORIZED BY MOTHER TONGUE, AND INCLUDES STUDENTS FROM ALL OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES)

Mother Tongue*	Number of Students**		% of Elementary Students in		% of Secondary Students in		
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Voc. Program	2 Year Prog.	5 Year Prog.
Born In Canada							
Italian	5987	703	3.0	1.3	8.0	6.0	59.3
Greek	2117	~~82~~	1.4	.3	~~6.1~~	~~6.1~~	~~69.5~~
Portuguese	820	~~11~~	1.5	1.6	~~18.2~~	~~0.1~~	~~63.6~~
Chinese	1912	237	1.1	.4	1.3	.4	86.1
Polish	883	650	1.2	.3	1.1	4.0	72.6
Ukrainian	1068	931	1.9	.5	.2	2.4	83.3
German	988	337	1.3	1.3	1.5	2.7	76.3
French	591	487	7.1	2.9	16.6	12.5	38.0
Not Born In Canada							
Italian	3992	2933	6.2	1.0	12.2	15.0	40.5
Greek	1662	617	2.9	.4	9.2	17.7	41.6
Portuguese	2808	950	5.6	.6	15.9	23.7	34.7
Chinese	938	776	.8	.3	1.5	3.2	77.1
Polish	410	523	3.6	.5	2.1	8.0	60.2
Ukrainian	108	176	.9	0.0	.6	3.4	74.4
German	297	375	1.3	1.0	1.6	2.9	70.1
French	153	124	2.0	0.0	1.6	7.2	60.5

* Each language group includes both students who learned the language before English and students who learned the language at the same time as English.

** Percentages based on numbers less than 100 are crossed to remind readers to interpret results with caution.

1975 and 1970 Comparison (Elementary)

Except for the Spanish group, the language groups in Tables 7 and 8 were the same ones selected in the comparable report from the 1970 survey. The tables from the 1970 survey are included in this report as Tables 7A and 8A. Table 7 and 7A include only students from low occupational status homes (Category 2); Tables 8 and 8A include all students regardless of their parents' occupational status. Generally, for each Canadian-born language group in Special Class A in Table 7, there was a very slight proportional increase over 1970. On the other hand, most non-Canadian-born language groups showed a slight general decrease from 1970 (Table 7A). The important exception was the Italian group where the proportion in Special Class A almost doubled (from 5.9 to 11.5 per cent) over the five year period. But during this period the number of Italian-speaking students from occupational category 2 declines from 3145 to 859. Part of the decline, which was similar across all occupational categories, resulted from a large scale transfer of students to the Separate School Board. The results suggest that there may have been somewhat lower rates of transfer of students being served in Special Classes.

Generally, for each Canadian-born language group in Special Class A in Table 8, there was a slight increase over 1970 (Table 8A). The outstanding case was the Portuguese-speaking group where the proportion of students in Special Class A increased from 1.5 in 1970 to 3.5 per cent in 1975. Even though the differences within the non-Canadian-born groups were generally less clear-cut between the two surveys, the Italian-speaking group showed a distinct increase from 6.2 to 10.7 per cent. Again the total number of students decreased by over 70 per cent.

1975 and 1970 Comparison (Secondary)

The secondary schools underwent some organizational changes between 1970 and 1975. While the special vocational and 2-year programs in 1970 are different in some respects from Levels 1, 2, 3 and 4 in 1975, the 5-year program in 1970, because of its general academic nature and university-orientation, remains quite similar to the Level 5 course of study in 1975. Hence, only comparisons on a Level 5 basis will be made.

Generally, the various Canadian-born language groups from occupational category 2 in Table 7 showed very slight variations from 1970 in the proportion of students in Level 5. However, there were large shifts within three non-Canadian-born language groups. The Greek group increased from 35 per cent in 1970 to 59 per cent in 1975, Chinese from 71 to 80 per cent, and Polish from 51 to 73 per cent. The decrease from 58 to 50 per cent for the German-speaking group is rather tenuous because there were only 38 non-Canadian-born German students in Toronto secondary schools in 1975.

Among Canadian-born students from all occupational categories in Table 8, there was only one major shift between 1970 and 1975: the proportion of French-speaking students in Level 5 increased from 38 to 52 per cent. While the proportion of Portuguese-speaking students decreased from 64 to 42 per cent, the number of such students in secondary school in 1970 was only 11.

There were three major shifts between 1970 and 1975 within the non-Canadian-born students in Table 8: the proportion of Greek-speaking students in Level 5 increased from 42 to 59 per cent, the proportion of Chinese-speaking increased from 77 to 84 per cent, and the proportion of Polish-speaking students went from 60 to 75 per cent. Other language

groups of non-Canadian-born students remained relatively stable between the two periods in terms of participation in Level 5 courses.

SUMMARY

The survey established that almost 50 per cent of the 1975 school population in Toronto came from low socio-economic backgrounds; 46 per cent had English as a second language, and almost 60 different countries were respectively claimed as "country of birth" by at least 25 students. Approximately 7.5 per cent of the elementary school population were served by special education programs, and approximately 60 per cent of the secondary school population were enrolled in Level 5 courses.

It was subsequently established that students' background characteristics were consistently related to program placement. In this respect, the socio-economic background of students in the Toronto school system was generally a far better predictor of both special class placement (Special Class A) and level of study in the secondary school than either country of birth or mother tongue.

All students were classified according to whether or not they were born in Canada and whether or not English was first language[7]. Each of the four immigrant/language groups was examined separately for relationships between their socio-economic status and program placement. On this basis, there were significant differences within each of the four groups.

In terms of program placement, students in the lower socio-economic categories (2 to 4) were consistently different from students in the higher categories (8 and 9). The difference was obvious within the Canadian-born, English first language group; .7 per cent of the elementary school students with parents as labourers, taxi drivers, porters, etc. (Category 2), were in Special Class A, while less than

---

7 See page 4.

1 per cent of the students with parents as physicians, engineers, pilots, etc. (Category 9) were in such classes. In this same group, 20 per cent of the secondary school students with parents from occupational Category 2 were enrolled in Level 3, while only 2 per cent of those with parents from Category 9 were enrolled in that level. Moreover, the proportion of (secondary school) students in Level 5 with parents in occupational Category 9 was more than double that for students with parents in Category 2 (90 per cent vs. 40 per cent). This pattern persisted in varying degrees within the other three immigrant/language groups.

Students whose parents were in the special categories (Category 10 to 16) of non-employed, generally revealed patterns of relationships similar to those found for students with parents in occupational Category 2. For instance, in the Canadian-born, English first language group, one out of seven students (14 per cent) with unemployed parents (Category 13) was in Special Class A. Among the four immigrant groups, the range in the proportion of students in Special Class A was 3.4 (Canadian-born, English second language) to 6 per cent (Canadian-born, English first language). These differences are relatively modest when compared to the differences generally noted between the lowest and highest socio-economic categories.

In terms of the over-all proportion of students in Level 5, the range between the immigrant groups was from 56 to 68 per cent -- a difference of 12 per cent. However, the range <u>between</u> students with parents in the lowest (2) and highest (9) occupational categories <u>within</u> the Canadian-born, English first language group was from 40 to 90 per cent; for the non-Canadian-born, English second language group the range was from 48 to 91 per cent.

An investigation of students from one and no-parent homes revealed that a high proportion of them (6 to 9% vs. 5% overall) were enrolled in Special Class A but that the proportion enrolled in Level 5 courses approximated the general population (56 to 62% vs. 61% overall). The relationships between occupational status and program placement were also apparent among students from homes where both parents were not present.

The same basic pattern of relationships between socio-economic background and program placement was found among students born in Great Britain, United States and the West Indies. However, the occupational mix of immigrants from these three areas was dissimilar. The overall proportion of students enrolled in Level 5 courses was 60 per cent from the West Indies, 68 per cent from Great Britain and 87 per cent from the United States.

The program placement of Canadian and foreign-born students from nine non-English language groups was also investigated. In addition to sizable intergroup differences, differences were noted within some groups, between 1970 and the 1975 survey. The pattern of program placement also differed within some language groups between the Canadian and foreign-born. In most cases, a higher proportion were in Special Class A and a lower proportion in Level 5 from among the foreign-born.

DISCUSSION

Up to this point, the first three reports from the 1975 Every Student Survey have been basically statistical. However, the educational significance of the results warrants comment.

The strong relationship between socio-economic background and school program placement is not an isolated finding. It was reported by H. S. Becker in the United States (Becker, 1961) and by S. W. Miller of Britain a decade later (Miller, 1971). Miller summarized the situation as follows:

> "It is now well established that effective use of educational opportunities is limited for the child or adolescent belonging to a working-class family and enhanced if he is a member of a middle-class family, especially if it is a professional one."
>
> (Miller, 1971, p. 13)

A year later, T. Husen (1972), in a report for The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, wrote that the relationship pervades all industrial societies. While there is widespread agreement about the existence of the relationship, there is no consensus about why the relationship persists, nor about ways of changing it (Rossi, 1961). Some say schooling makes little or no difference but that the family does (Jencks, 1970). Others say "schools tend to play an important role" if only as a dispenser of credentials (Becker, 1961). The role of the school in reinforcing or reforming existing social patterns is much debated (Coleman, 1966; Mosteller & Moynihan, 1972; Jackson, 1973).

Despite the ongoing academic debate, many people have strong beliefs about what schools could and should do. For example, Goslin (1965) asserted that:

> "The school is charged with the responsibility of providing basic social norms, the responsibility of providing the new members of the society with information to assume their proper role in the democratic process."
>
> (Goslin, 1965, p. 55)

A similar view was expressed by Miller (1971):

> "To regard mere academic failure as the whole of school failure is a limited view. Education is concerned with teaching people how to live and not merely to pass examinations."
>
> (Miller, 1971, p. 9)

But the ease with which such objectives are realized depends on whether educational planning is underlain by what Husen (1972) distinguished as the conservative, liberal, or "new" conception of equality of educational opportunity. He described the conservative view:

> "God had bestowed different amounts of capacity upon each human being, and it was up to the individual to make the best possible use of that capacity."
>
> (Husen, 1972, p. 28)

The liberal viewpoint was put this way:

> "Each individual is born with a certain, relatively constant, capacity or intelligence. The educational system should be so designed as to remove external barriers of an economic and/or geographical nature that prevent able students from the lower classes taking advantage of their inborn intelligence which entitles them to due social promotion."
>
> (Husen, 1972, p. 31)

Husen described the "new" conception:

> "It is not enough to establish formal equality of access to education. One has also to provide greater equality in the pre-school institutions or in the regular school for the children of various social backgrounds to acquire intelligence."
>
> (Husen, 1972, p. 38)

While many people might agree with the "new conception," that in itself would not establish a course of action. Furthermore,

the fact that changes in relationships between program placement and occupational background have been modest within a five year period does not establish that the Inner City program is not working or is not worthwhile. More time and/or significant changes in other social institutions may be required before shifts in these basic social relationships could be evident. From an overall perspective, the provision of four years of secondary schooling to most young people has been accomplished only very recently.

While efforts to compensate socially disadvantaged continue, the ethnic composition of the school population remains in flux. Dramatic changes were noted over a five year period in the proportion of students from various countries and language backgrounds. This cultural diversity places additional demands on the school system. The task of communicating with parents and coordinating the efforts of home and school is complicated. A simple notice to parents in English is often not adequate. In many schools, several languages are now needed to communicate with a majority of parents.

The importance of sensitizing teachers to the particular needs of students is intensified where the students come from scores of different cultures.

On the basis of an extensive review of the relevant research, Carl Braun (1976) of the University of Calgary, argued:

> "It is the 'teacher expectation of pupil' and the vicious circle it triggers that will determine largely the child's self-image, and ultimately academic success or failure."
>
> (Braun, 1976, p. 209)

He added:

> "Teachers need to be sensitized to the biases and stereotypes they hold and encouraged to examine these seriously in relation to their classroom behavior."
>
> (Braun, 1976, p. 209)

For any system which encompasses the diversity of cultures found in the Toronto school system, these words of caution are extremely relevant. The recommendations regarding "System Sensitivity" in the Report of the Work Group on Multicultural Programs (1976) demonstrate that the Board is alert to these important issues. These recommendations, which concern teacher education, teacher in-service, employment and staffing policy, and racism, are one of five sets designed to adapt the school system to the pluralistic nature of the city's population. The report makes it clear that the task of educating many immigrant students extends beyond providing English instruction, accommodating diverse learning styles, and includes teaching ethnic tolerance (even appreciation) by word and example.

The long term social advantages of preserving and developing the existing linguistic and cultural reservoir in the Toronto school population are considerable. If students are taught to tolerate one another and to work and live harmoniously in a multicultural milieu, it can influence the community directly and immediately. Age-old animosities and prejudices can be held in check and the spread of bigotry controlled. Security of person and property is a natural consequence of assuring dignity and self-respect to every person in school and throughout life. Furthermore, a population which respects all cultures and speaks a variety of languages is likely to participate easily and effectively in the international arenas of trade and diplomacy. The delights of Caravan are an annual reminder that life is enriched when people of diverse cultures share their rich traditions with one another. From this standpoint, the ethnic diversity of the Toronto school system provides a significant educational opportunity.

But the survey identified other persistent and emerging needs. As in earlier studies, males continue to be over-represented in elementary Special Class A programs. The expansion of the special education program from 1970 to 1975 accommodated mainly boys. This relationship between sex and educational performance in elementary school is extremely persistent. For some reason, females adapt better than males to the existing school system. This seems to be true as well in secondary school where at every socio-economic level, a smaller proportion of males than females were found in the Level 5 (university-oriented) program. This imbalance is reversed in university where males significantly outnumber females.

There was an increase in the proportion of students from one-parent and no-parent families from 15.5 per cent in 1970 to 18.4 per cent in 1975. These families contribute a very significant proportion of students to the special classes and to the Level 1, 2, and 3 enrolments in secondary schools. The particular educational problems of this growing sector of the school population may warrant more extensive investigation or some adaptation of program. Students from non-conventional family situations would seem as deserving of special attention as other socially or culturally disadvantaged groups.

The Every Student Survey is a description of the 1975 population in the city school. It shows how students of various background are placed relative to other groups and to their own group five years earlier. While some groups are shown to perform better than others, there are numerous exceptions in every case. Large numbers of students from apparently disadvantaged groups do very well in the schools. The results of the survey should not be used to discourage them or their teachers.

To offset educational disadvantage and thus extend a full range of educational and occupational options to every student is a massive undertaking. It will require considerable effort and goodwill from all the directly affected parties -- teachers, parents, administrators, trustees, and the students themselves as well as from those less directly affected people such as ratepayers, employers, and agents of other social institutions.

REFERENCES

Becker, H. S. Schools and systems of stratification. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (Eds.), Education, economy and society. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Braun, C. Teacher expectation: sociopsychological dynamics, Review of Educational Research, 1976, 46 (2).

Coleman, J. S. et al. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington: The U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Deosaran, R. A. Educational aspirations: what matters? Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1975, #135.

Deosaran, R. A. Parent's occupation, student's mother tongue and immigrant status (1975 Every Student Survey). Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1976, #139.

Deosaran, R. A. and Wright, E. N. Student's background and its relationship to class and programme (The 1975 Every Student Survey). Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1976, #138.

Goslin, D. A. The school in contemporary society. Illinois: Scott-Foresman and Co., 1965.

Humphreys, L. G. Race and sex differences and their implications for educational and occupational mobility. Educational theory, 1976, 26 (2).

Husen, T. Social background and educational career. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1972.

Jackson, P. W. After apple-picking (a response to Jencks). Harvard Educational Review, February 1973, 43 (1).

Jencks, C. Inequality: a reassessment of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books Inc., 1973.

Melby, E. O. Community education: America's social imperative. In H. W. Hickey and C. V. Voorhees (Eds.), The role of the school in community education. Michigan: The Pendell Company, 1969.

Miller, S. W. Educational opportunity and the home. London: Longman Group Ltd., 1971.

Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D. P. (Eds.) On equality of educational opportunity. New York: Random House, Inc., 1972.

Multicultural programs, final report of the work group. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, February, 1976.

Ontario Ministry of Education. Education in the primary and junior division. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education, 1975.

Rossi, P. H. Social factors in academic achievement: a brief review. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floud, and C. A. Anderson (Eds.), Education, economy and society. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

Wright, E. N. Programme placement related to selected countries of birth and selected languages. Toronto: The Board of Education for the City of Toronto, Research Department, 1971, #99.

APPENDIX A

Programs* Within Special Class Categories

A**	B	C
Special Program - primary, junior and senior	Deaf	Perceptual
Withdrawal	Hearing	Behavioural
	Health	Learning Centre
	Vision	Reading
	Orthopaedic	Gifted
	Language	
	Hospital & Institutional	
	Home Instruction	

* New Canadian programs not included

** NOTE: Category A is a gross grouping which includes students with a wide variety of academic problems and does not reflect the variety and intensity of programs which are offered for them.

APPENDIX B

Table 9 - Program Placement of Students Who Did Not Have Both Parents in the home (1970 Data).

TABLE 9

SPECIAL CLASSES ATTENDED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS AND PROGRAMS ATTENDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
WHO DID NOT HAVE BOTH PARENTS IN THE HOME
(CATEGORIZED USING SELECTED OCCUPATIONAL CATEGORIES)
(1970 Data)

Occupational Categories	Number of Students		% of Elementary Students in		% of Secondary Students in		
	Elementary	Secondary	Special Class "A"	Special Class "B"	Special Voc. Program	2 Year Prog.	5 Year Prog.
Only Mother Present							
2	1133	640	4.5	1.5	9.7	13.9	47.8
14	3522	1383	6.9	1.4	13.4	15.2	39.0
TOTAL	8450	4006	4.8	1.5	8.0	11.4	51.5
Only Father Present							
2	431	291	7.2	1.4	11.3	15.8	38.1
TOTAL	1012	732	5.7	1.5	8.1	10.9	51.8
Neither Parent Present							
2	167	186	9.6	3.0	10.7	19.9	30.1
8	77	90	14.3	10.4	21.1	23.3	25.5
14	87	40	10.3	2.3	25.0	10.0	32.5
TOTAL	693	900	7.6	8.5	12.3	12.5	42.7

APPENDIX C

TABLE 10 - Head of Household's occupation for students born in Great Britain, United States and the West Indies.

TABLE 10

HEAD OF HOUSEHOLDS OCCUPATION FOR STUDENTS OF VARIOUS COUNTRIES OF BIRTH

Occupational Categories	Great Britain 1975	Great Britain 1970	United States 1975	United States 1970	West Indies 1975	West Indies 1970
2 labourers, taxi drivers	29.2	31.1	9.8	11.5	49.0	33.1
3 sheetmetal workers, mechanics	8.7	11.5	1.7	1.9	12.4	17.1
4 sales clerks, machinists	4.1	8.4	4.9	2.4	7.3	5.9
5 printing workers, electricians	11.1	12.5	6.4	5.2	9.5	9.6
6 dental technicians, embalmers	11.4	7.2	9.8	6.3	8.9	8.7
7 musicians, athletes	4.7	4.7	7.5	7.9	1.5	3.7
8 clergymen, librarians	7.6	6.5	17.9	12.6	1.2	3.3
9 accountants, engineers, lawyers	17.3	11.6	36.8	40.0	3.4	6.6
10 retired, Workmen's Compensation	.4	.2	.8	.6	.2	.2
11 Welfare, Mother's Allowance	-	-	-	.2	.1	-
12 university students, adult training	.5	.4	2.2	1.8	1.1	1.2
13 unemployed	1.9	.9	1.9	1.4	4.0	3.3
14 housewife	2.4	2.0	2.4	5.5	3.6	3.1
15 student on his/her own	.2	.3	.6	.2	.1	.3
16 group home head	.4	-	.5	-	.1	-
TOTAL*	1650	2508	983	793	4593	1855

* These totals do not include no information or missing data.

APPENDIX D

TABLE 11 - Students from the West Indies (categorized by specific country).

TABLE 11

STUDENTS FROM THE WEST INDIES
(CATEGORIZED BY SPECIFIC COUNTRY)

Country	Number of Students		Total
	Elementary	Secondary	
Jamaica	1778	675	2453
Trinidad and Tobago	765	401	1166
Guyana (includes British Guiana)	633	206	839
Barbados	92	51	143
St. Kitts, St. Vincent, St. Lucia	79	39	118
West Indies (unclassified)	50	26	76
Grenada	24	27	51
Antigua	13	18	31
Bahamas	14	1	15
TOTAL	3448	1444	4892

APPENDIX E

TABLE 12 - Level of Study recorded by Secondary School students.

TABLE 12

LEVEL OF STUDY RECORDED BY SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS
(RECORDED LEVELS COLLAPSED INTO FIVE CODES)

LEVEL RECORDED BY STUDENT	NO. OF STUDENTS	CODED LEVEL*	NO. OF STUDENTS
1, 1 and 2	174	1	174
2	998	2	1049
2 and 3	51		
3	3282	3	3314
3 and 4	32		
4	6945	4	7113
4 and 5	168		
5	16907	5	18420
5 and 6, 6	1513		
TOTAL	30070		30070

* These five codes used in tables in text.

APPENDIX F

TABLE 13 - Socio-economic codes for household heads.

TABLE 13

SOCIO-ECONOMIC CODES FOR HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD
(COMPARISON WITH 1970 EVERY STUDENT SURVEY REPORT NO. 91)
(TAKEN FROM REPORT NO. 138)

Category Number	Blishen's Category	Category Description	Per Cent '70	Per Cent '75	Number in 1975 Elem.	Number in 1975 Sec.
1		No information or unknown	2.86	4.78	2301	2130
2	25-31.99	Labourers, truck drivers, porters	42.74	42.01	27018	11931
3	32-34.99	Bartenders, sheetmetal workers, repairmen	7.68	6.05	3934	1676
4	35-38.99	Sales clerks, jewellers, stationary engineers, machinists	4.97	3.10	1939	938
5	39-42.99	Pressmen, printing workers, electricians, members of the armed forces, clerical occupations	9.27	9.16	5242	3251
6	43-49.99	Actors, tool and diemakers, medical and dental technicians, embalmers, real estate salesmen	6.09	8.52	4865	3034
7	50-54.99	Musicians, stenographers, athletes	4.35	2.90	1777	910
8	55-65.99	Clergymen, various owners and managers, insurance salesmen, librarians	4.68	4.62	2806	1474
9	66-76.99	Teachers, professional engineers, physicians, computer programmers, air pilots	8.00	8.41	5345	2453
10		Pensioner, retired, workman's compensation, disabled or ill*	.70	1.16	390	690
11		Welfare, mother's allowance	.37	.18	104	65
12		Adult training or re-training	.64	.68	491	136
13		Unemployed	3.15	3.42	2401	770
14		Mother only, housewife	4.40	4.64	2994	1303
15		Respondent on his/her own	.09	.16	6	144
16		Group home head* (e.g., social worker, etc.)	--	.20	75	110
TOTAL PER CENT			99.99	99.99		
TOTAL NUMBER			103,818	92,703	61688	31015

* Not specifically coded in 1970.

APPENDIX G

TABLE 14 - Statistical Table

The statistical table on page 51 can be used to facilitate comparisons which the reader may want to make between different groups in the same table. The following example may be helpful.

On page 22, Table 8, it is noted that within the Canadian-born group, 52 per cent of the French and 79 per cent of the German students are in level 5. The percentage difference is 27. To test whether this difference is significant we look at the number of students in each group. There are almost 500 (secondary school) French students and over 400 (secondary school) German students.

Since the percentage difference is 27 we use the second section of the table. The number of French students is around 500 so we read across the fourth line of the table. Since there are over 400 German students we stop at where the fifth column cuts the fourth line.

A value of 5.4 - 6.8 is listed; our observed difference of 27 per cent is much greater than the 6.8 listed. Thus we can say that there is a significant difference (at the .05 level) between the groups in the percentage found in level 5.

Please note that if the observed difference falls within the listed range, the significance of the difference would be questionable since the upper limit is a "safety" factor.

TABLE 14

APPROXIMATE SAMPLING ERROR* OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PERCENTAGES OBTAINED FOR TWO DIFFERENT GROUPS OF STUDENTS**

No. of Students	No. of Students							
	2,000	1,000	700	500	400	300	200	100
For Percentages from 35 to 65								
2,000	3.2-4.0	3.9-4.9	4.4-5.5	5.0-6.2	5.5-6.9	6.2-7.8	7.4-9.2	10-12
1,000		4.5-5.6	4.9-6.1	5.5-6.9	5.9-7.4	6.6-8.3	7.7-9.6	10-13
700			5.3-6.6	5.9-7.4	6.3-7.9	6.9-8.6	8.0-10	11-13
500				6.3-7.9	6.7-8.4	7.3-9.1	8.4-10	11-13
400					7.1-8.9	7.6-9.5	8.7-11	11-14
300						8.2-10	9.1-11	12-14
200							10-12	13-15
100								14-17
For Percentages around 20 or 80								
2,000	2.5-3.1	3.1-3.9	3.5-4.4	4.0-5.0	4.4-5.5	5.0-6.2	5.9-7.4	8.2-9.8
1,000		3.6-4.5	3.9-4.9	4.4-5.5	4.7-5.9	5.3-6.6	6.2-7.8	8.4-10
700			4.3-5.4	4.7-5.9	5.0-6.2	5.5-6.9	6.4-8.0	8.6-10
500				5.1-6.4	5.4-6.8	5.8-7.2	6.7-8.4	8.8-11
400					5.7-7.1	6.1-7.6	6.9-8.6	9.0-11
300						6.5-8.1	7.3-9.1	9.2-11
200							8.0-10	9.8-12
100								11-14
For Percentages around 10 or 90								
2,000	1.9-2.4	2.3-2.9	2.6-3.2	3.0-3.8	3.3-4.1	3.7-4.6	4.4-5.5	
1,000		2.7-3.4	3.0-3.8	3.3-4.1	3.6-4.5	4.0-5.0	4.6-5.8	
700			3.?-4.0	3.5-4.4	3.8-4.8	4.1-5.1	4.8-6.0	
500				3.8-4.8	4.0-5.0	4.4-5.5	5.0-6.2	
400					4.2-5.2	4.6-5.8	5.2-6.9	
300						4.9-6.1	5.5-6.9	
200							6.0-7.5	
For Percentages around 5 or 95								
2,000	1.4-1.8	1.7-2.1	1.9-2.4	2.2-2.8	2.4-3.0	2.7-3.4		
1,000		1.9-2.4	2.1-2.6	2.4-3.0	2.6-3.2	2.9-3.6		
700			2.3-2.9	2.6-3.2	2.7-3.4	3.0-3.8		
500				2.8-3.5	2.9-3.6	3.2-4.0		
400					3.1-3.9	3.3-4.1		
300						3.6-4.5		

* The values shown are the differences required for significance (two standard errors) in comparisons of percentages derived from two different subgroups of a survey. Two values--low and high--are given for each cell. The low value is based on the formula $2\sqrt{p(1-p)(1/n_1 + 1/n_2)}$. The high value is about 1.25 greater than the low value and provides a "safety factor" to allow for departures from "representativeness" of the sample.

** This table was adapted from: Freedman, Whelpton, & Campbell. Family planning, sterility and population growth. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959, pp. 453-459.